

Regge Trajectories and Renormalization Group

Vladimir A.Petrov

*Division of Theoretical Physics, IHEP,
Protvino, Russia*

Abstract

On the basis of the RG invariance we show, in particular, that the Regge trajectory intercept cannot be calculated as a function of the coupling constant.

Since the early days of the complex angular momentum approach [1] to obtaining the high-energy asymptotic behaviour of the scattering amplitude [2] numerous attempts were undertaken to calculate the leading j -plane singularities (poles, cuts...) and their t -dependence in the course of the asymptotic summation of some "leading" terms in the perturbative expansions (see e.g. [3]).

Last 30 years are marked by widely spread hopes that the problem can find its solution in the framework of the study of some QCD-motivated Bethe-Salpeter-type equations [4] the kernel of which is a truncated series in the QCD coupling, α_s .

During some quite a long time the result obtained in Ref.[4] that the leading singularity is of the form

$$j_0 = 1 + \frac{12}{\pi} \ln 2 \cdot \alpha_s$$

with α_s assumed to be $O(10^{-1})$, was considered, in particular, as an explanation of the fast rise of the structure functions at small x observed at HERA.

Eight years ago it was obtained in Refs [5] that the further term, proportional to α_s^2 , had an unexpectedly large and negative coefficient which invalidated the use of this value of j_0 for explanation of the HERA data:

$$j_0 \approx 1 + \frac{12 \ln 2}{\pi} \alpha_s \left[1 - 20 \frac{\alpha_s}{\pi} \right]. \quad (1)$$

Moreover, result (1), which depends on α_s at an unspecified scale, exacerbated the important problem of the scale and renormalization scheme dependence of j_0 . An attempt to minimize such a dependence with use of some "optimal" choice of renormalization conditions was undertaken in Ref. [6].

However, one has to still bear in mind a requirement of the RG invariance of all physical observable quantities.

This fully concerns j_0 as a singularity of the physical amplitude and therefore all attempts to find an expression for j_0 that only "slightly" violates RG invariance are of the same origin as an attempt to use "slightly" non-Lorentz invariant expression for, say, the mass of a particle.

From the RG invariance of the scattering amplitude and, hence, its singularities in the j -plane it follows that a generic j -plane singularity (which has generally to depend on the 4-momentum transfer squared, t) $j_0(t)$ is of the form [7]:

$$j_0(t) = \Phi\left[\frac{t}{\mu^2}e^{K(\alpha_s)}\right] \quad (2)$$

where Φ is some still unknown function, $K'(\alpha_s) = 1/\beta(\alpha_s)$, $\mu^2 \frac{\partial}{\partial \mu^2} \alpha_s = \beta(\alpha_s)$, μ is the renormalization scale. Eq.(2) explicitly displays the manifest RG invariance of $j_0(t)$.

Eq.(2) allows to make some interesting observations. Let us assume $t=0$ with μ^2 fixed and non-zero. Then

$$j_0(0) = \Phi(0). \quad (3)$$

Eq.(3) means that j_0 does not depend on α_s at all! In other words the number $j_0(0)$ cannot be calculated by any manipulation with perturbative expansions.

On the other hand if one assumes $t = -\mu^2$ then

$$j_0(t) = f(\alpha_s(t)). \quad (4)$$

From Eq.(4) one can see that to obtain $j_0(0)$ from theory one has to know the value of $\alpha_s(0)$. Straightforward (but never proved) confinement requirement is $\alpha_s(0) = \infty$, and this brings us back to the situation discussed below Eq.(3). In the literature there exists an approach, so-called "analytical

QCD”, in which, on the basis of microcausality, a finite $\alpha_s(0)$ is obtained [8]. For self-consistency we have to conclude that

$$\Phi(0) = \Phi(e^{K[\alpha_s(0)]}), \quad (5)$$

i.e. $K[\alpha_s(0)] = -\infty$ and β -function has to vanish at $\alpha = \alpha_s(0)$.

The facts discussed above are not very encouraging for those who try to obtain $j_0(t)$ from various B-S-like equations for the scattering amplitude. At any rate it is mandatory to work with RG-invariant BS-kernels. The latter is an extremely difficult task and this, as one can suppose, underlies the discussion of the diffractive scattering in terms of the $N = 4$ supersymmetric version of QCD, where, as is well known, $\beta = 0$, and above mentioned problems seem to be lifted [9]. Inviting supersymmetry is by no means motivated by the available data which in no way indicate even a tiny trace of supersymmetry. In principle one could expect such traces in high-energy collisions in the events with very large energy-momentum transfers what is definitely not the case for diffractive processes. The same can be said about recent attempts to use the string theory.

Does it mean that the diffractive processes are hopeless in the sense of their study in the framework of QCD? Not at all, but this study requires serious non-perturbative insights. Let us take, for instance, the forward scattering amplitude $T(s, 0)$. Due to RG invariance

$$T(s, 0) = F(\alpha_s(s)) \quad (6)$$

On the other hand the existing data seem to indicate that the forward scattering amplitude behaves asymptotically as

$$T(s, 0) \sim i \text{ const } s \log^2 s + \dots \quad (7)$$

Such a behaviour corresponds to the asymptotics, obtained in some model by W. Heisenberg [10], and later was proved to be a general upper bound [11]. Asymptotic behaviour of the type of (7) was later obtained in a field-theoretic model for the eikonal [12]. In terms of the running coupling $\alpha_s(s)$ it could look as an awful ”antiperturbative” dependence:

$$T(s, 0) \sim i \text{ const } \frac{1}{\alpha_s^2(s)} e^{\frac{1}{\beta_0 \alpha_s(s)}}. \quad (8)$$

which clearly shows that in this case one can hardly obtain such a behaviour from an asymptotic series in $\alpha_s(s)$. Rather it could be obtained from some effective field configuration which gives a leading extremum of the action in the path-integral representation for the scattering amplitude [13]:

$$T(s, t) \sim \int dA_\mu dq d\bar{q} e^{i \frac{S[A, q, \bar{q}]}{\alpha_s}} \tilde{H}(p_1) \tilde{H}(p_2) \tilde{H}(p_3) H(0),$$

where $H(x) = \int \frac{d^4p}{(2\pi)^4} e^{-ipx} \tilde{H}(p)$ is the Heisenberg source field composed of the elementary fields $A, q, \bar{q}$ and corresponding to hadron fields.

This possibility is in agreement with the fact that at higher energies the effective interaction region grows and collective, quasiclassical field configurations seem to be more relevant than any description in terms of elementary excitations (gluons, quarks).

Eq. (8) looks as a paradox, because it seems quite natural that $T \rightarrow 0$ if we take the free-field limit $\alpha_s \rightarrow 0$. Two options can take place. The first is to agree that, contrary to (7), $T(s, 0) \rightarrow 0$, because $\alpha_s \rightarrow 0$ corresponds to $s \rightarrow \infty$. The second is to admit that the limit $\alpha_s \rightarrow 0$ does not commute with the path integration.

Acknowledgements

I thank A.I. Alekseev, A.K.Likhoded, A.A.Logunov and N.E. Tyurin for useful conversations on various aspects of the subject of this work.

References

1. T. Regge. Nuovo Cimento, 8, 671 (1959)
2. G.F. Chew and S.C. Frautschi. Phys.Rev.Lett. 7 (1961) 394
3. B.W. Lee and R.F. Sawyer. Phys.Rev. 127 (1962) 2266;
B.A. Arbuzov, A.A. Logunov, A.N. Tavkhelidze Phys.Lett. 2(1962) 150
4. L.N. Lipatov. Sov.J.Nucl.Phys. 23 (1976) 338;
E.A. Kuraev, L.N. Lipatov and V.S. Fadin. Sov.Phys. JETP
44 (1976) 443.
Ya.Ya. Balitzkij and L.N. Lipatov. Sov.J.Nucl.Phys. 28 (1978) 822.
5. V.S. Fadin and L.N. Lipatov. Phys.Lett. B429 (1998) 127;
G. Camici and M.Ciafaloni. Phys.Lett. B430 (1998) 349
6. S.J. Brodsky, V.S. Fadin, V.T. Kim, L.N. Lipatov and
G.V. Pivovarov. JETP Lett. 70 (1999)155
7. N.N. Bogolyubov and D.V. Shirkov. Introduction to the theory of
quantized fields. Wiley, New York, 1980.
G.B. West. Phys.Rev. D27(1983) 1402.
8. D.V. Shirkov and I.L. Solovtsov. Phys.Rev.Lett. 79 (1997) 1209.
The stability of finite $\alpha_s(0)$ with respect to all higher loop contributions
was shown by A.I. Alekseev. Few Body Syst. 32 (2003) 193.
9. A.V. Kotikov and L.N. Lipatov. Nucl. Phys. B661 (2003) 19
10. W. Heisenberg. Z.Phys. 133 (1952) 65
11. M. Froissart. Phys.Rev. 123 (1961) 1053
A. Martin. Nuovo Cim. 42 (1966) 901
12. H. Cheng and T.T. Wu. Phys.Rev. 182 (1969) 1852.
13. Some steps towards this goal can be found in the following papers:
H. Moreno and H.M. Fried. Phys.Rev. D12 (1975) 2031;
P. Suranyi. Phys.Rev. D17 (1978) 1160.